Ifw   AF
36913

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 18638-04-5010

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Glenn McGARRY, et al.	)	Confirmation No. 7173
	)	
Application No.: 09/764,782	)	Group Art Unit: 3693
	)	
Filed: January 17, 2007	)	Examiner: J. Borlinghaus
	)	
For: SYSTEM FOR CAPTURING DEAL	)	
INFORMATION	)	**MS: Appeal Brief**

Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop Appeal Brief
Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

APPELLANT'S BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. §41.37 TRANSMITTAL FORM

1.   Transmitted herewith is an Appellants' Brief Under 37 C.F.R. §41.37, which is being submitted further to the Notice of Appeal filed August 27, 2008.

2.   Additional papers enclosed.

[ ]   Drawings: [ ] Formal   [ ] Informal (Corrections)
[ ]   Information Disclosure Statement
[ ]   Form PTO-1449, ___ references included
[ ]   Citations
[ ]   Declaration of Biological Deposit
[ ]   Submission of "Sequence Listing", computer readable copy and/or amendment pertaining thereto for biotechnology invention containing nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence.

3.   Oral Hearing Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.194

[ ]   Oral hearing is hereby requested.

[ ]   Fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(d) is enclosed.

4.   Extension of time

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R.
1.136(a) apply.

[X]   Appellants petition for an extension of time, the fees for which are set out in 37
C.F.R. 1.17(a), for the total number of months checked below:

Total months requested	Fee for extension	[fee for Small Entity]
[X] one month	$ 120.00	$ 60.00
[ ] two months	$ 450.00	$225.00
[ ] three months	$1,020.00	$510.00
[ ] four months	$1,590.00	$795.00

Extension of time fee due with this request: $

[X]   If an extension of time is required, please consider this a Petition therefor.

5.   Fee Payment

[ ]   No fee is to be paid at this time.

[X]   The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge $ 630.00 ($510.00 for the
appellants' brief fee 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c) and $120.00 for the extension of time fee
37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)) to Deposit Account No. 50-0310).

[X]   The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may
be required, including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, or credit any
overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310.

DB1/62081926.2

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: <u>December 9, 2008</u>   By: *Carol B. Kosowski*

Carolyn Bleck Kosowski
Registration No. 60,818

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202.739.3000
Fax.: 202.739.3100

PATENT
Attorney Docket No. 018638-04-5010

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of:)	Confirmation No. 7173
)	
Glenn McGARRY, *et al.*)	
)	
Application No.: 09/764,782)	Group Art Unit: 3693
)	
Filed: January 17, 2001)	Examiner: J. Borlinghaus
)	
For: SYSTEM FOR CAPTURING DEAL)	
INFORMATION (*as amended*))	
)	

Commissioner for Patents
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window
Mail Stop <u>Appeal Brief - Patents</u>
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

<u>APPELLANTS' BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. §41.37</u>

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal filed on August 27, 2008 in

connection with the above-identified patent application, and appealing the final rejections of

claims 26-58 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office in a final Office Action dated

June 7, 2008. The fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2) is being filed concurrently

herewith. The period for filing this brief extends through December 21, 2008 with a one month

extension of time petition and fee. The fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2) is being filed

concurrently herewith.

DB1/62272104.2

I.   REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is Barclays Capital Inc. of New York, New York.

II.   RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are not aware of any other appeals or interferences that will directly affect, will be directly affected by, or will otherwise have a bearing on the decision in this appeal.

III.   STATUS OF CLAIMS

The following summarizes the status of the claims in the present application:

Claims 1-25 have been cancelled;

Claims 26-58 are pending in the present application;

Claims 26-58 stand finally rejected; and

Claims 26-58 are being appealed.

IV.   STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

All Amendments have been entered to date. On August 27, 2008, Appellants filed a Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review in response to the final Office Action dated June 7, 2008. A Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review was mailed on October 21, 2008 indicating that the application remains under appeal with claims 26-58 rejected. In response, Appellants file this appeal brief. The pending claims are attached to this Brief in the Claims Appendix.

V.   SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

In summary, the claimed invention is directed towards a system, method, and computer program product for capturing deal information of executed trades, including one or more product types of one or more financial products, directly from remotely located client devices. (*See* FIG. 11: 1100, page 6, lines 5-12 and lines 17-24, page 12, lines 3-6). For example, the product types may include swaps, swaptions, caps, floors, FX, or cash. (*See* page 7, lines 13-17). The deal capture computer routes the captured information to one or more internal systems based on the one or more product types of the one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals. (*See* FIGS. 1 and 11, page 9, lines 13-16).

Claim 26 recites a system including one or more remotely located client devices (FIG. 11: 1100, page 6, lines 5-12) to capture information concerning one or more deals from one or more users (page 6, lines 17-24, page 12, lines 3-6). The captured information identifies a party, a counterparty, and one or more product types of one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals (FIGS. 2-3, page 11, lines 6-9, page 12, lines 14-22), where the one or more deals are executed trades (FIG. 1, page 6, lines 17-18, page 7, line 5) and the one or more users are the party or the counterparty to the one or more deals (FIG. 3, page 12, lines 14-22). Claim 1 also recites a deal management computer in communication with the one or more remotely located client devices to process the one or more deals through multiple deal states (FIG. 1: 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, FIG. 11: 1104, page 6, lines 6-8, page 16, lines 22-24), the captured information being routed based on the one or more product types of the one or more

financial products associated with the one or more deals (page 9, lines 13-16).

Claim 36 recites a method comprising capturing, via one or more remotely located client devices (FIG. 11: 1100, page 6, lines 5-12), information concerning one or more deals from one or more users (page 6, lines 17-24, page 12, lines 3-6). The captured information identifies a party, a counterparty, and one or more product types of one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals (FIGS. 2-3, page 11, lines 6-9, page 12, lines 14-22), where the one or more deals are executed trades (FIG. 1, page 6, lines 17-18, page 7, line 5) and the one or more users are the party or the counterparty of the one or more deals (FIG. 3, page 12, lines 14-22). Claim 36 further recites a step of communicating the captured information concerning the one or more deals to a deal management computer (FIG. 11: 1100, 1102, 1104, 1106, page 6, lines 17-24, page 7, lines 1-9) and processing, via the deal management computer, the one or more deals through multiple deal states (FIG. 1: 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, page 6, lines 6-8, page 16, lines 22-24), the captured information being routed based on the one or more product types of the one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals (page 9, lines 13-16).

Claim 46 recites a computer program product including a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, configure the computer to perform a method. (*See* FIG. 1: 1104, 1110, 1112, 1114, the interfaces shown in FIG. 2-10, page 6, lines 5-12 and lines 19-24, page 10, lines 20-24). The steps of the method include capturing, via one or more remotely located client devices (FIG. 11: 1100, page 6, lines 5-12 and lines 19-24), information concerning one or more deals from one or more users (page 6, lines 17-24, page 12, lines 3-6). The captured information identifies a party, a

counterparty, and one or more product types of one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals (FIGS. 2-3, page 11, lines 6-9, page 12, lines 14-22), where the one or more deals are executed trades (FIG. 1, page 6, lines 17-18, page 7, line 5) and the one or more users are the party or the counterparty of the one or more deals (FIG. 3, page 12, lines 14-22). The method further includes the steps of communicating the captured information concerning the one or more deals to a deal management computer (FIG. 11: 1100, 1102, 1104, 1106, page 6, lines 17-24, page 7, lines 1-9) and processing, via the deal management computer, the one or more deals through multiple deal states (FIG. 1: 102, 104, 105, 106, 107, page 6, lines 6-8, page 16, lines 22-24), the captured information being routed based on the one or more product types of the one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals (page 9, lines 13-16).

Claims 34, 35, 44, 45, 54, and 55 recite that the party or the counterparty is a hedge fund (page 8, line 23 to page 9, line 6) or an investment bank (page 12, line 14 to page 13, line 1).

Claims 56-58 recite that the deal management computer is further in communication with a plurality of internal systems (FIG. 11: 1104, page 8, lines 3-15), each of the internal systems being associated with one or more product types (page 8, lines 3-15, page 9, lines 13-15), and the captured information being routed to at least one of the plurality of internal systems (page 8, lines 3-15, page 9, lines 13-15).

VI.   GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Whether claims 26-33, 36-43 and 46-53 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over

Sandhu et al. in view of McErlean.

Whether claims 34, 35, 44, 45, 54, and 55 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over

Sandhu et al. in view of McErlean and Official Notice.

Whether claims 56-58 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sandhu et al. in

view of McErlean.

VII.   ARGUMENT

A.   Sandhu et al. and McErlean both fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 26, 36, and 46

There is no dispute that Sandhu et al. fails to teach or suggest at least "the captured

information being routed based on the one or more product types of the one or more financial

products associated with the one or more deals [wherein the one or more deals are executed

trades]." (See final Office Action dated August 7, 2008 (referred to herein as "FOA"), p. 3, par.

2.) Appellants assert that McErlean also fails to teach or suggest such features.

As an initial matter, Appellants respectfully submit it is unfair for the Office to make

blanket conclusions with no citation of support in one Office Action and then provide the support

in the next Office Action to make the Office Action final. In the non-final Office Action of

January 10, 2008, the Office did not include a citation to the particular part of McErlean that was

being relied upon as required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2). (See Office Action of 1/10/08, p. 5,

par. 2.) In an interview on April 2, 2008, Appellants explained the distinctions between

McErlean and the claimed invention, which the Office acknowledged. (*See* Interview of 4/2/08,

p. 5.) Appellants further discussed that the Office failed to provide citations of support in

McErlean. *Id.* However, the Office did not indicate during the interview which portions of

McErlean were being relied upon. *Id.* In the response of April 4, 2008, Appellants responded to

the Office Action based on the Appellants best understanding of the rejection as no citations to

McErlean were provided. (*See* Response of 4/4/08, p. 11, par. 1-2.) Instead of issuing a second

non-final Office Action indicating which portions of McErlean the Office was relying upon or

addressing the distinctions between the claimed invention and the prior art identified by

Appellants in the interview and the Response, the Office attempted to correct its failure to

provide citations by asserting that McErlean was relevant in its entirety and simply reiterated its

previous rejections. (*See* FOA, p. 7, par. 4-5; p. 8, par. 1-3.) After making the assertion that

McErlean was relevant in its entirety, the Office provided citations of support, namely to the

Background of the Invention, in McErlean and provided an explanation of the rejection based on

the Background of the Invention of McErlean that was never presented in the non-final Office

Action. *Id.* The Office Action was made final. Appellants submit this type of prosecution is

unreasonable as Appellants did not have an adequate opportunity to respond to the Office's

rejections.

As to the Office's rejections of claims 26, 36, and 46, the Office alleges in the final

Office Action of August 7, 2008 that McErlean teaches "the system rout[ing] deals based on the

one or more product types of the one or more financial products associated with the one or more

DB1/62272104.2

deals" referring to column 1, lines 11-65 of McErlean. (*See* FOA, p. 3, par. 3.) Column 1, lines 11-65 of McErlean does not teach "the captured information being routed based on the one or more product types of the one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals" as alleged in the final Office Action.

In particular, column 1, lines 11-65 of McErlean have nothing to do with routing messages based on "types" or "tags" as alleged in the final Office Action. In fact, columns 1 and 2 of McErlean describe the prior art, and problems associated thereto, that led to the invention described in McErlean. In column 1, McErlean describes that existing systems route messages using a text analyzer to determine the context of an email message by analyzing the text of the message (*e.g.*, text sequence), categorizing the message based on the analysis (*e.g.*, balance inquiry, request for transfer, interest rate inquiry), and then routing the message to someone who may be best to handle the message. Thus, the message in McErlean is categorized based on the text of the email message. (*See* McErlean: col. 1, lines 49-59.) The message in McErlean is not routed based on a tag or message type (*i.e.*, a product type) as alleged in the final Office Action. Further, the message in McErlean is not routed based on a product type as required in claims 26, 36, and 46. Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion of the feature of claims 26, 36, and 46 of routing captured information of one or more deals based on one or more product types of the one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals in McErlean as alleged in the final Office Action.

In addition, the Office relies upon Sandhu et al. to allegedly teach "remotely located client devices to capture information concerning one or more deals from one or more

users…wherein the one or more deals are *executed trades*" as recited in independent claims 26, 36, and 46. (Emphasis added.) (*See* FOA, p. 3, par. 2.) Appellants assert that Sandhu et al. fails to teach or suggest these features.

As discussed in the responses filed October 16, 2007 and April 4, 2008, Sandhu et al. is directed to the "front-end" of a trading system. That is to say, Sandhu et al. is directed to a system that facilitates trading/negotiations. By contrast, the present invention is directed to a "middle" and "back-end" system that processes already executed trades or consummated deals. Sandhu et al. discloses that the Member and Provider can submit a transaction to their respective back-end systems using the Sandhu et al. system. (*See* par. [0211]-[0212].) However, Sandhu et al. does not disclose any details of the middle or back-end systems, which are the focus of Appellants' invention.

Further, the "transactions" disclosed in Sandhu et al. are not "executed trades," but rather transactions that will occur in the future. For example, Sandhu et al. discloses that "the Member must decide on the type of transaction it wishes to execute… and structure the desired transaction." (*See* Sandhu: para. [0205].) In other words, the deal discussed in Sandhu et al. is not an "executed trade" since the transaction in Sandhu et al. has not yet been executed.

Moreover, the Office improperly dismisses the difference between an "executed trade" and a transaction that has not yet taken place based on the allegation that claim 32 recites that there is an "in process" state and a "pending trade authorization" state in the final Office Action. (*See* FOA, p. 8-10.) Appellants respectfully submit that an executed trade undergoing processing or under pending authorization does not change the fact that the trade has been executed. In

other words, both parties have already agreed to the trade. To reiterate, <u>Sandhu's</u> system is a front-end trading system that facilitates trading (*i.e.*, matching sellers and buyers). The "transaction" relied upon in the Office Action refers to a transaction that is being structured by the members <u>to be</u> executed.

B.   **<u>Sandhu et al.</u> and <u>McErlean</u> cannot be combined in the manner asserted to render independent claims 26, 36, and 46 obvious.**

In addition to the fact that <u>Sandhu et al.</u> and <u>McErlean</u> both fail to teach the features of the claimed invention, Appellants assert that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified <u>McErlean</u> with <u>Sandhu et al.</u> in the manner asserted in the final Office Action to render the claims obvious. In particular, to make <u>McErlean</u>, namely column 1, apply to at least independent claims 26, 36, and 46, the Office alleges that if a message containing product type information is received in <u>McErlean's</u> system, it will route that message to someone based on the product type contained in the message. However, there is no factual basis for this conclusion. Column 1 of <u>McErlean</u> merely discloses that existing systems classify a message based on text analysis (*e.g.*, frequency or sequence). There simply is no teaching or suggestion that the classification is based on one or more product types of one or more financial products associated with executed trades as recited in independent claims 26, 36, and 46.

M.P.E.P. §2143.01(III) specifically states that "[t]he *mere fact* that references *can* be combined or modified *does not render* the resultant combination *obvious* unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination" (citing to *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d

1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). Neither <u>Sandhu</u> nor <u>McErlean</u> discloses routing captured information of one or more deals based on one or more product types of the one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals. Accordingly, to state otherwise would be improper hindsight as the systems of <u>Sandhu</u> and <u>McErlean</u> are being modified based on the Appellants' own disclosure. Appellants' respectfully submit that there is no factual basis to support the modification alleged in the final Office Action in rejecting at least independent claims 26, 36, . and 46.

C. **<u>Sandhu et al.</u>, <u>McErlean</u>, and <u>Official Notice</u> fail to teach or suggest all of the features of claims dependent 34, 35, 44, 45, 54, and 55**

As to the rejection of dependent claims 34, 35, 44, 45, 54, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over <u>Sandhu et al.</u> in view of <u>McErlean</u> and <u>Official Notice</u>, the Office's use of <u>Official Notice</u> fails to take into account that claims 34, 35, 44, 45, 54, and 55 further define the type of captured information recited in independent claims 26, 36, and 46.

The Office alleges that it is "old and well known that hedge funds and investment banks are traditional and conventional parties to financial transactions in the art of investing and financial markets." (*See* FOA, p. 6, par. 3.) However, claims 34, 35, 44, 45, 54, and 55 do not define the parties to the transaction, but instead further define the captured information of the independent claims. Thus, Appellants respectfully submit that capturing information identifying a party and a counterparty, where *the party or the counter party is a hedge fund or an investment bank*, is still not taught by the taking of <u>Official Notice</u>.

Further, the Office alleges that the claimed features appear to be directed towards the

intended users. (*See* FOA, p. 6, par. 3.) Appellants respectfully disagree with this allegation.

Claims 34, 35, 44, 45, 54, and 55 further define the captured information as discussed above, and

do not refer to the users of the system.

In addition, Appellants respectfully disagree with the Office's statements that Appellant

did not attempt to traverse the Official Notice statements. (*See* FOA, p. 10, par. 2.) Appellant

traversed the Official Notice statement by specifically pointing out the errors in the Office's use

of Official Notice as discussed above. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(b).

**D.   Sandhu et al. and McErlean both fail to teach or suggest all of the
         features of dependent claims 56-58**

The final Office Action alleges that the combination of Sandhu et al. and McErlean teach

the features of dependent claims 56-58. Appellants respectfully disagree.

In the final Office Action, Sandhu et al. is relied upon to teach "the deal management

computer is further in communication with a plurality of internal systems, each of the internal

systems being associated with one or more product types." (*See* FOA, p. 5, par. 1.) However,

the cited portions of Sandhu et al., namely FIG. 1, fail to teach or suggest "each of the internal

systems being associated with one or more product types." Instead, FIG. 1 shows the overall

system architecture, which includes the CFOWeb System and the Member/ Provider systems.

The Member/ Provider systems include various components, such as pricing 40, payments, 50,

trading 60, confirmation 70, and settlement 80. The CFOWeb System includes servers for

trading 160, portfolio management 170, reports 180, analysis 190, calendar server 200, and news

and research server 210. (*See also* paragraph [0192] of Sandhu et al.) However, neither the

Member/ Provider systems or CFOWeb system in FIG. 1 are "associated with one or more

product types" as recited in claims 56-58.

Furthermore, the combination of Sandhu et al. and McErlean fails to teach or suggest that

the captured information is routed to at least one of the plurality of internal systems, where the

plurality of internal systems are associated with the one or more product types. McErlean is

relied upon to teach this feature. (*See* FOA, p. 5, par. 3.) However, column 1, lines 11-65 of

McErlean has nothing to do with routing messages based on "tags" or "types" as alleged in the

final Office Action. In fact, columns 1 and 2 of McErlean describe the prior art, and problems

associated thereto, that led to the invention described in McErlean. In column 1, McErlean

describes that existing systems route messages using a text analyzer to determine the context of

an email message by analyzing the text of the message (*e.g.*, text sequence), categorizing the

message based on the analysis (*e.g.*, balance inquiry, request for transfer, interest rate inquiry),

and then routing the message to someone who may be best to handle the message. Thus, the

message in McErlean is categorized based on the text of the email message. (*See* McErlean: col.

1, lines 49-59.) The message in McErlean is not routed based on a tag or message type (*i.e.*, a

product type), as alleged in the final Office Action, to an internal system. (*See* FOA, p. 3, par. 3.)

Further, the message in McErlean is not routed based on a product type. Accordingly, there is

no teaching or suggestion of the feature of claims 56-58 of captured information being routed to

at least one of the plurality of internal systems (based on the one or more product types as recited

in claims 26, 36, and 46), where the plurality of internal systems are associated with the one or

more product types in <u>McErlean</u> as alleged in the final Office Action.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Appellants respectfully request the reversal of the rejections

asserted in the final Office Action rejection and request allowance of all of the pending claims. If

there is any other fees due in connection with the filing of this Brief, please charge the fees to our

Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R.

§1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be

charged to our deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: December 9, 2008   By: *Carolyn B. Kosowski*

Carolyn Bleck Kosowski
Reg. No. 60,818

Customer No.: 009626
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001

VIII. APPENDIX A - CLAIMS

1-25. (Cancelled).

26. (Previously Presented): A system, comprising:

one or more remotely located client devices to capture information concerning one or more deals from one or more users, the captured information identifying a party, a counterparty, and one or more product types of one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals, wherein the one or more deals are executed trades and the one or more users are the party or the counterparty to the one or more deals; and

a deal management computer in communication with the one or more remotely located client devices to process the one or more deals through multiple deal states, the captured information being routed based on the one or more product types of the one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals.

27. (Previously Presented): The system of claim 26, wherein the one or more financial products include a cash instrument or a derivative instrument.

28. (Previously Presented): The system of claim 27, wherein the one or more product types of the one or more financial products include one or more of the following: swaps, swaptions, caps, floors, FX, and cash.

29. (Previously Presented): The system of claim 26, wherein the one or more remotely located client devices include an interface to select the one or more product types of the one or more financial products and to identify the party and the counterparty associated with the one or more deals.

30. (Previously Presented): The system of claim 26, wherein the one or more remotely located client devices include an interface to access information concerning the one or more deals during processing of the one or more deals.

31. (Previously Presented): The system of claim 26, wherein the multiple deal states include states for trade authorization and settlement.

32. (Previously Presented): The system of claim 26, wherein the multiple deal states include (i) DEAL IN PROCESS, (ii) DEAL PENDING TRADE AUTHORIZATION, (iii) DEAL PENDING MIDDLE OFFICE PROCESSING, and (iv) DEAL IN BACK OFFICE.

33. (Previously Presented): The system of claim 26, wherein completion of the one or more deals results in a mature deal or an inactive deal.

34. (Previously Presented): The system of claim 26, wherein the party or the counterparty is a

hedge fund.

35. (Previously Presented): The system of claim 26, wherein the party or the counterparty is an investment bank.

36. (Previously Presented): A method, comprising:

capturing, via one or more remotely located client devices, information concerning one or more deals from one or more users, the captured information identifying a party, a counterparty, and one or more product types of one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals, wherein the one or more deals are executed trades and the one or more users are the party or the counterparty of the one or more deals;

communicating the captured information concerning the one or more deals to a deal management computer; and

processing, via the deal management computer, the one or more deals through multiple deal states, the captured information being routed based on the one or more product types of the one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals.

37. (Previously Presented): The method of claim 36, wherein the one or more financial products include a cash instrument or a derivative instrument.

38. (Previously Presented): The method of claim 37, wherein the one or more product types of

the one or more financial products include one or more of the following: swaps, swaptions, caps, floors, FX, and cash.

39. (Previously Presented): The method of claim 36, wherein the step of capturing includes selecting, via the one or more remotely located client devices, the one or more product types of the one or more financial products and identifying, via the one or more remotely located client devices, the party and the counterparty associated with the one or more deals.

40. (Previously Presented): The method of claim 36 further comprising accessing, via the one or more remotely located client devices, information about the one or more deals during processing of the one or more deals.

41. (Previously Presented): The method of claim 36, wherein the multiple deal states include states for trade authorization and settlement.

42. (Previously Presented): The method of claim 36, wherein the multiple deal states include (i) DEAL IN PROCESS, (ii) DEAL PENDING TRADE AUTHORIZATION, (iii) DEAL PENDING MIDDLE OFFICE PROCESSING, and (iv) DEAL IN BACK OFFICE.

43. (Previously Presented): The method of claim 36, wherein completion of the one or more deals results in a mature deal or an inactive deal.

44. (Previously Presented): The method of claim 36, wherein the party or the counterparty is a

hedge fund.

45. (Previously Presented): The method of claim 36, wherein the party or the counterparty is an

investment bank.

46. (Previously Presented): A computer program product including a computer readable

medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions that, when executed on a

computer, configure the computer to perform a method comprising the steps of:

capturing, via one or more remotely located client devices, information concerning one or

more deals from one or more users, the captured information identifying a party, a counterparty,

and one or more product types of one or more financial products associated with the one or more

deals, wherein the one or more deals are executed trades and the one or more users are the party

or the counterparty to the one or more deals;

communicating the captured information concerning the one or more deals to a deal

management computer;

processing, via the deal management computer, the one or more deals through multiple

deal states, the captured information being routed based on the one or more product types of the

one or more financial products associated with the one or more deals.

47. (Previously Presented): The computer program product of claim 46, wherein the one or more financial products include a cash instrument or a derivative instrument.

48. (Previously Presented): The computer program product of claim 47, wherein the one or more product types of the one or more financial products include one or more of the following: swaps, swaptions, caps, floors, FX, and cash.

49. (Previously Presented): The computer program product of claim 46, wherein the step of capturing includes selecting, via the one or more remotely located client devices, the one or more product types of the one or more financial products and identifying, via the one or more remotely located client devices, the party and the counterparty associated with the one or more deals.

50. (Previously Presented): The computer program product of claim 46, wherein the computer executable instructions, when executed by the computer, direct the computer to perform the method further comprising the step of accessing, via the one or more remotely located client devices, information about the one or more deals during processing of the one or more deals.

51. (Previously Presented): The computer program product of claim 46, wherein the multiple deal states include states for trade authorization and settlement.

52. (Previously Presented): The computer program product of claim 46, wherein the multiple

deal states include (i) DEAL IN PROCESS, (ii) DEAL PENDING TRADE AUTHORIZATION,

(iii) DEAL PENDING MIDDLE OFFICE PROCESSING, and (iv) DEAL IN BACK OFFICE.

53. (Previously Presented): The computer program product of claim 46, wherein completion of

the one or more deals results in a mature deal or an inactive deal.

54. (Previously Presented): The computer program product of claim 46, wherein the party or

the counterparty is a hedge fund.

55. (Previously Presented): The computer program product of claim 46, wherein the party or

the counterparty is an investment bank.

56. (Previously Presented): The system of claim 26, wherein the deal management computer is

further in communication with a plurality of internal systems, each of the internal systems being

associated with one or more product types, and the captured information being routed to at least

one of the plurality of internal systems.

57. (Previously Presented): The method of claim 36, wherein the deal management computer is

further in communication with a plurality of internal systems, each of the internal systems being

associated with one or more product types, and the captured information being routed to at least

one of the plurality of internal systems.

58. (Previously Presented): The computer program product of claim 46, wherein the deal management computer is further in communication with a plurality of internal systems, each of the internal systems being associated with one or more product types, and the captured information being routed to at least one of the plurality of internal systems.

IX.   APPENDIX B - EVIDENCE

[NONE]

X.   <u>APPENDIX C - RELATED PROCEEDINGS</u>

[NONE]